REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 24, 25 and 28-33 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 24 and 25 are the independent claims. Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 24, 25, and 33 are amended. Claims 34-35 are new. Claims 4-5, 9-23, and 26-27 were previously cancelled. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 24 stand rejected under 35 USC §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserts that the claims at issue in this rejection do not fall within one of the four statutory categories of an invention, as defined by 35 USC 101. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that these process claims must be 1) tied to a particular machine, or 2) transform underlying subject matter. Applicant amends claims 1 and 24 to tie the claims to a particular machine. For at least this reason, Applicant believes that these claims are drawn toward subject matter that is patentable under 35 USC 101. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §101 be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 – *Kashiwagi*

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 24-25 and 28-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0138238 ("Kashiwagi"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Kashiwagi teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations. Applicant asserts that Kashiwagi does not teach

or suggest "the still picture data being reproduced as a *slideshow*, the audio data being reproduced with the still picture data," as recited in amended claim 1. As the Examiner notes (on pg. 4 of the Office Action), Kashiwagi does not teach decoding and outputting "still picture data." Therefore, Kashiwagi does not teach or suggest reproducing still picture data "as a *slideshow*," as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, because Kashiwagi does not reproduce still picture data, Kashiwagi clearly does not teach or suggest reproducing "audio data" with "still picture data" (where the still picture data is reproduced "as a *slideshow*"), as recited in claim 1.

Further with regard to claim 1, Kashiwagi does not teach or suggest "the outputting of the decoded audio data is not synchronized with the outputting of the decoded still picture data when the decoded audio data is output with the decoded still picture data, *the audio data being reproduced without interrupting the reproducing of the still picture data as the slideshow*," as recited in claim 1. Instant example embodiments provide separate management of the reproduction of "audio data" and "still picture data." Therefore, reproduction of "audio data" and "still picture data" occur independently of each other, allowing reproduction of the "audio data" to be accomplished *without interrupting* reproduction of the "still picture data." That is to say, the "audio data" may, for instance, be reproduced by repeatedly playing a same short "audio data" clip while the "still picture data" is also being reproduced (meaning, the "audio data" clip may be shorter in duration than the "still picture data"). Or, alternatively, a long "audio data" clip may be reproduced and continue to be played even after reproduction of the "still picture data" has ended (meaning, the long "audio data" clip may be longer in duration than the "still picture data"). Because Kashiwagi does not teach or suggest this separate management (and, independence) associated

with reproducing "audio data" and "still picture data" (and, Kashiwagi does not even teach or suggest separate management and independence of reproducing "audio data" and video data), Kashiwagi therefore does not teach or suggest "the outputting of the decoded audio data is not synchronized with the outputting of the decoded still picture data when the decoded audio data is output with the decoded still picture data, *the audio data being reproduced without interrupting the reproducing of the still picture data as the slideshow*," as recited in claim 1.

With regard to independent claims 24 and 25, Applicant asserts that these claims contain features similar to independent claim 1, such that at least the same arguments can be made.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant asserts that independent claims 1, 24 and 25 are patentable. Due at least to the dependence of the remaining claims on the respective independent claims, Applicant also asserts that these claims are patentable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this art ground of rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 – *Kashiwagi in view of Kato*

Claims 8 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kashiwagi, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0164152 ("Kato"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to claim 8, the Examiner asserts that Kashiwagi teaches the limitations of base claim 1 and Kato teaches the limitations of claim 8. Applicant asserts that Kashiwagi in view of Kato does not teach or suggest "the playlist file including *information indicating whether or not the audio data associated with the sub-*

playitem is usable for the still picture data," as recited in amended claim 8. Kashiwagi only teaches reproducing a bitstream that may include video-data, audio data and sub-picture data. But no portion of Kashiwagi teaches "*information*" that indicates if "audio data" of a sub-playitem is *usable* with "still picture data." Likewise, Kato only teaches reproducing an AV stream, generally. But Kato does not teach or suggest (or, have a reason to contemplate) providing such "*information*" that indicates that audio data is usable with still picture data, as recited in claim 8. For at least these reasons, Kashiwagi in view of Kato does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 8.

With regard to claim 33, Applicant asserts that claim 33 contains features similar to claim 8, such that at least the same arguments can be made.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant asserts that claims 8 and 33 are patentable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this art ground of rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

<Remainder of Page Left Intentionally Blank>

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks and amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the rejections has been addressed and overcome, placing the present application in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,
HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By _____

Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416
Corey E. Smith, Reg. No. 57,807

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

GDY/CES:cfc

1127368.1